



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,650	03/11/2004	Jianying Li	140536 (12553-390)	6325
45428 7590 01/11/2012 Armstrong Teasdale LLP (12553 - 1000) Patrick W. Rasche 7700 Forsyth Boulevard Suite 1800 St. Louis, MO 63105			EXAMINER MOTSINGER, SEAN T	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/11/2012	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@armstrongteasdale.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/798,650	LI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SEAN MOTSINGER	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,15-17,19,20,29-31,33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-6,15-17,19-20,29-31,33-34 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Response to Applicants Arguments/Amendments

Applicants Arguments/Amendments filed on 10/27/2011 have been entered and made of record.

Applicants Arguments/Amendments with respect to 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and the amendments overcome the rejections.

Applicants Arguments/Amendments with respect to 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered by are rendered moot in view of new grounds of rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-6, 15, 19-20 and 29, 33-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being rendered obvious by Li et al US 6,449,330 in view Kachelriess et al Generalized multidimensional adaptive filtering for conventional and spiral single-slice, multi-slice and Cone-Beam CT. Med Phys. 28 (4) April 2001 of in further view of Weng et al US 5,404,293.

Re claim 1 Li discloses A method for reconstructing an image of an object, said method comprising: scanning an object using a computed tomographic (CT) imaging apparatus (column 3 lines 25-30) to acquire projections of the object; determining a set of scaled prepped projection thresholds (column 4 lines 5-10 note the thresholds are prepared and one is of greater scale and one of lesser scale than a previously known single threshold method); associating selected smoothing kernels with said thresholds (column 4 lines 10-20); utilizing said smoothing kernels (column 4 lines 35-40) and said projections (column 4 lines 35-40) to produce three dimensional (See column 3 lines 35-40) smoothed projections (final projections column 4 lines 35-50) in accordance with said thresholds; and filtering and backprojecting the three dimensional smoothed projections (reconstructing column 4 lines 50-55) to generate an image of the object (column 4 lines 50-55).

Li further discloses a first threshold of the set of thresholds triggers smoothing (any one of thresholds one through 3 see lines 25-30)

Li does not disclose determining, utilizing the projections, a set of thresholds; filtering in three dimensions and when the first threshold is not triggered smoothing in three dimensions is not performed. Kachelriess discloses determining, utilizing the projections, a set of thresholds(see section d note that the threshold is based on the view angle of the projection and page 479 second paragraph threshold is determined

Art Unit: 2624

based on local information) filtering in three dimensions (page 478 section C 3d adaptive filtering) and when the first threshold is not triggered smoothing (below the threshold is does not trigger filtering page 478 section B) in three dimensions is not performed (page 478 section C 3d adaptive filtering). The references are combinable because they both deal with noise reduction of CT data. The motivation is to reduce noise while maintaining high resolution See abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kachelriess with Li to reach the aforementioned advantage.

Li further does not disclose scaling the projections by a constant value. Weng discloses scaling the projections by a constant value (see column 4 lines 10-25). One of ordinary skill in the art could have easily combined Weng with Li and the results scaling the data to based on geometry would be predictable. Further one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to scale the projection as disclosed in Weng to adjust for geometry (see column 4 lines 10-25 the projections are scaled based on the geometry). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Li and Kachelriess with Weng to reach the aforementioned advantage

Re claim 5 Li discloses wherein said utilizing smoothing kernels and said projections to produce smoothed projections comprises utilizing a smoothing gain factor to modulate smoothing of said smoothed projections (column 4 lines 45-50).

Art Unit: 2624

Re claim 6 Li further discloses wherein said smoothing gain factor is a function of said projections (column 4 lines 45-50).

Re claim 15 ad 19-20 These claims, recite a CT scanner comprising a detector source and computer system for performing the method of claims 1, 5 and 6 respectively. Li discloses performing the method in a CT scanner as well see column 3 lines 25-40).

Re claim 29 and 33-34. These claims, recite a computer readable medium storing instructions for performing the method of claim 1, 5 and 6 respectively. Li discloses a computer readable medium see column 5 lines 15-20).

Claims 2-3,16-17, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Weng and Kachelriess.

Re claim 2 Li further discloses wherein a smoothing kernel is associated with each threshold (column 4 lines 35-40). Li further discloses the set of thresholds contains more the one threshold and in one embodiment the set of thresholds includes three thresholds (column 4 lines 1-10); furthermore one of the smoothing kernals is associated with each threshold (column 4 lines 15-25). Li does not specifically recite that 4 thresholds could be used, however It is clear from the claim language of claim 1

Art Unit: 2624

and column 4 lines 1-10 that Li intends the set of thresholds to be discretionary and not necessarily limited 3 (i.e Li implies that other numbers of threshold greater than 1 may be implemented.) Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to try a number of thresholds not equal to 3 but greater than 1. The most obvious numbers to try would be 2 and 4 since they are closest to 3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Li with 4 thresholds.

Re claim 3 Li further discloses wherein a one-to-one correspondence exists between said smoothing kernels and said thresholds (column 4 lines 35-45).

Re claim 16 and 17 These claims, recite a ct scanner for performing the method of claims 2 and 3 respectively. Li discloses performing the method in a CT scanner as well see column 3 lines 25-30).

Re claim 30 and 31. These claims, recite a computer readable medium storing instructions for performing the method of claim 2 and 3 respectively. Li discloses a computer readable medium see column 5 lines 15-20).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SEAN MOTSINGER whose telephone number is (571)270-1237. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on 571-272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Motsinger
1/6/2012

/Bhavesh M Mehta/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624